

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Federal Trade Commission, et al.,  
 Plaintiff(s),  
 v.  
 International Markets Live, Inc., et al.,  
 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:25-cv-00760-CDS-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 141-142]

Pending before the Court are Intervenor's motion for protective order, Docket No. 141, and motion to brief and resolve that motion on an emergency basis, Docket No. 142. There are several threshold problems here.<sup>1</sup>

First, the motion for protective order is not signed. *See* Docket No. 141 at 2, 24; *but see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a).

Second, the motion for protective order is not written with the clarity required for proper adjudication. For example, the motion seeks a protective order pursuant to Rule 26(c). *See* Docket No. 141 at 12. As the case law cited makes plain, that rule governs issuance of protective orders from discovery. *See, e.g., U.S. E.E.O.C. v. Caesars Ent., Inc.*, 237 F.R.D. 428, 432 (D. Nev. 2006) (resolving motion for protective order concerning deposition). Although unclear, it does not appear that the instant motion is directed to any pending discovery matter. Indeed, were this a discovery-related motion, it would violate the local rules requiring that the subject discovery requests and responses be provided therein. *See* Local Rule 26-6(b). Moreover, meaningful

---

<sup>1</sup> Movants are not exempt from the basic requirements for motion practice simply because they indicate that there are emergency circumstances involved. *See, e.g., Cardoza v. Bloomin' Brands, Inc.*, 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1142 (D. Nev. 2015).

1 argument is not presented as to how it would be proper to issue a protective order to provide the  
2 relief being sought.<sup>2</sup>

3 Accordingly, the motion for protective order is **DENIED** without prejudice, and the motion  
4 for emergency treatment is **DENIED** as moot. If Intervenorors continue to seek relief, they must  
5 ensure that they fashion their motions appropriately, rely on legal authority pertinent to the relief  
6 sought, and file the motion in CMECF using the correct event. Local Rule IC 2-2(b). If  
7 Intervenorors are seeking to modify or clarify the preliminary injunction order, for example, they  
8 must file a motion framed as such.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: October 14, 2025

11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Nancy J. Koppe  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 <sup>2</sup> The motion quotes without elaboration from an old district court case from a different  
27 circuit, a decision that itself provides no explanation as to how a protective order issued pursuant  
28 to Rule 26(c) is properly issued in the context of this motion. *See* Docket No. 141 at 12. To the  
extent Intervenorors meant this bare reference to somehow explain how the relief sought is warranted  
under Rule 26(c), the Court does not find that reference to be sufficiently developed argument.